

**IMAC-QA Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**  
**For**  
**October 24, 2005**

**Members Present**

Jackie Bennett, Racine County; John Haine, DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Marilyn Rudd; DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Vicki Jessup, DHFS/DCHF/BEM; Kathy Judd, Dane County; Donna King, DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Lisa Hanson, DHFS/DCHF/BEM; Brian Fangmeier, DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Pam Lohaus, DHFS/OSF/Southern Region; Mary Moyer, DHFS/DHCF/BEM;

**Via Phone Conference**

Jacaié Coutant, Milwaukee County; Lorie Mueller, LaCrosse County; Jennifer Winter, Managed Health Services; Joanne Ator, Door County. Allison Espeseth, Covering Kids.

**Members Absent**

Bernadette Connolly, DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Chris Elms, Dane County; Marcia Williamson, DHFS/DHCF/BEM

**1. Minutes from September 26, 2005**

- The September minutes were read and approved.

**2. MA/FS 2<sup>nd</sup> party review status and discussion**

*Main points:*

- A status report from the MA/FS 2<sup>nd</sup> Party Review Workgroup was shared with the committee.
- This workgroup continues to move forward using a percentage of a county's caseload to determine the number of cases each county has to read with 2/3 of the cases read being MA/FS cases and 1/3 being MA only cases.
- A discussion comparing the current method of determining the number of cases to be read based on number of workers versus percentage of caseload ensued.
  - ✓ There is a problem with getting an accurate number of workers in each county who should be subject to second party reviews. In reality each county is self-declared.
  - ✓ The question is what workers should be included? Where does the accountability begin?
  - ✓ Vicki Jessup and John Haine stated that in Milwaukee the Verification and Change Center is not included in the worker count and it should be.
  - ✓ Vicki Jessup stated that ACD would assist the State identifying the worker count.

## **IMAC-QA Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**

**For**

**October 24, 2005**

- Jackie Bennett stated that the county's concern is if the percent of caseload method is used versus cases per worker it will result in a significant increase in the workload for Racine.
- Milwaukee County's concern is that the use of 1% brings their requirement up from an average of 250 cases to 943 cases per month.
- Joanne Ator stated that it is not an issue of not wanting to do the additional second party reviews but rather that it is an issue of the county's ability to do it. Her workload includes dealing with all programs including energy, benefit, budgeting, supervising staff how do you fit more in?
- John agrees that there are workload issues that have to be recognized but if the local agencies cannot incorporate the additional second party reviews into their workload then someone else will have to do them. If someone else conducts the second party reviews then the IM monies allocated to the counties for this task would have to be redirected to that workforce.
- Use of cases reviewed by a supervisor for other purposes would assist the counties in obtaining their number.
- The State plans on an implementation date of 2/1/2006. The work plan for the IMQA system involves:
  - ✓ System development through November
  - ✓ Testing in December
  - ✓ Training in January

### *Outcome/Next Steps*

The use of cases per worker methodology is dropped. The focus is now on the use of a percentage of the caseload. The MA/FS 2<sup>nd</sup> Party Review Workgroup will look at the numbers using .9% and .8% and the outcome will be shared at the next IMAC-QA Subcommittee meeting.

### **3. FS Payment Accuracy Update**

Error data from October 2004 through June 2005 was shared. The State was at 5.2 % with Milwaukee at 5.80%.

### **4. Penalties**

- The counties questioned the issue of the new language regarding penalties to the counties for failure to correct error cases. Previously the language was that a county could receive a \$250.00 for not correcting a case within 30 days. The new language states that the counties could receive a \$250.00 penalty for each month that an error was not corrected and \$250.00 for each month that a related benefit recovery was not processed. In addition another \$250.00 can be imposed if DHFS has to correct the case. This initiative did not come to the committee.
- John stated that it is contract language and not an issue to come before this committee although he believes it went to the Workload and Finance Committee.

## **IMAC-QA Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**

**For**

**October 24, 2005**

- Joanne wanted to know what happens when there are things beyond the agency's control such as the agency's ability to contact the client etc. It was stated that if the county made a reasonable effort to act there should not be a problem.
- John stated that the State would be open to extending the due dates the key is that the county must communicate with the State.
- An administrative memo regarding the agency's responsibilities and processes will be issued.

Next meeting **November 28, 2005**

Note taker for November: Kathy Judd